DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 401 758 FL 024 255

AUTHOR Varghese, Manka; Billmyer, Kristine
TITLE Investigating the Structure of Discourse Completion Tests.
PUB DATE 96
NOTE 21p.; For complete volume, see FL 024 252.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Journal Articles (080)
JOURNAL CIT Working Papers in Educational Linguistics; v12 n1 p39-58 Spr 1996

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Applied Linguistics; Discourse Analysis; Language Research; *Language Tests; *Linguistic Theory; *Native Speakers; Research Methodology; Responses; Sociolinguistics; *Speech Acts; Test Construction
IDENTIFIERS *Requests

ABSTRACT

A study examined internal structure of the Discourse Completion Test (DCT), a technique used to elicit data in sociolinguistic research, and effects of systematic modification to its situational prompt on subject response. The DCT is a questionnaire containing situations, briefly described, designed to elicit a particular speech act. Subjects read each situation and respond in writing to a prompt. Three versions of a DCT designed to elicit requests were used: an original that included needed information on requestive goal, social distance, and social dominance; an elaborated version with additional information on interlocutor's gender, role relationship, length of acquaintance, interaction frequency, whether the relationship was optional, and a description of setting; and an elaborated version in which students were asked to reflect 30 seconds before responding. Subjects were 55 native speakers of American English, all university students. Data were analyzed for request strategies of the head act, internal modification of the head act, length of entire request act and internal and external modification, and external modification of the head act. No significant response differences were found in head acts across versions, but significant differences were found across versions on mean length of request act and external modifications. Contains 14 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Investigating the Structure of Discourse Completion Tests

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Donnelly

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Manka Varghese & Kristine Billmyer

University of Pennsylvania
English Language Programs
Graduates School of Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 401 758

A significant and long-standing dilemma in sociolinguistic research concerns the methods used to collect the data, the validity of different types of data, and to quote Kasper and Dahl (1991) "...their adequacy to approximate authentic performance of linguistic action." (p. 215). As early as 1966 Labov detected variability among the same subjects depending solely on the instruments used by the researcher to collect data. More recently, Kasper and Dahl noted that in the study of pragmatics, "...we are dealing with a double layer of variability" (p.215): the first layer being that of sociolinguistic variability and the second layer being that of variability induced by the different data instruments. Some researchers have claimed that the most authentic data in sociolinguistic research is spontaneous speech gathered by ethnographic observation (Manes & Wolfson 1981). However, difficulties in relying solely on this method are well-documented (Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper 1989), and have led to the wide use of an elicitation procedure called the Discourse Completion Test (DCT). This paper examines the internal structure of Discourse Completion Tests and, in particular, investigates the effect of systematic modification to the DCT situational prompt on subject response.

Adapted in 1982 by Blum-Kulka for the purpose of investigating speech acts, the DCT is a questionnaire containing a set of very briefly described situations designed to elicit a particular speech act. Subjects read each situation and respond to a prompt in writing.

FL024355

Advantages of this method are well-known. Without question the DCT surpasses all others in ease of use, and as Beebe and Cummings (1985) conclude, result in the researcher's ability to collect a very large corpus of data, on a wide range of difficult-to-observe speech behaviors, in a short period of time. More importantly, they note, data elicited with this instrument are consistent with naturally occurring data, at least in the main patterns and formulas. These factors have led to the widespread use of DCTs in numerous speech act studies (Olshtain & Cohen 1983; Eisenstein & Bodman 1986; Beebe, Takahashi & Uliss-Weltz 1985) including the most

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ambitious research project on speech acts to date, the Cross Cultural Speech Act Realization Project - CCSARP (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989) which investigated requests and apologies across 13 languages.

Notwithstanding its appeal, critics have leveled charges at the instrument itself and have found disturbing discrepancies between DCT and spoken data. Beebe and Cummings (1985) found that DCTs failed to elicit the full range of formulas found in spoken data, and that they elicited responses more limited in length and deficient in the level of elaboration and frequency of repetition typical of human spoken interaction. Critics targeting design of the instrument itself cite the insufficiency of social and situational information in the situational prompt, omitting such things as background to the event, information on role relationship between the subject and the imaginary interlocutor, frequency of their interaction, and details of context and setting (Wolfson, Marmor & Jones 1989). What is missing according to Beebe and Cummings is the entire psychosocial dimension, which they point out, sets up a desire on the part of interlocutors to establish and maintain one's reputation with the expectation of a possible future relationship. Without setting the scene in a Hymesian sense (Hymes 1972), respondents are left to their own devices to invent one of their own situations, which could vary considerably from respondent to respondent, or more likely, not to invent one at all.

Nonetheless, it is evident that speakers in natural conversation have access to this powerful combination of interpersonal and contextual details, and that their unconscious continuous assessment of this information has an impact on their utterances.

The purpose of the present study is to investigate whether enhancing the DCT situation itself, by including a similar level and array of information afforded speakers in spontaneous interactions, would result in DCT data more closely approximating authentic performance. Although previous studies have compared DCTs to other methods of data collection (see Kasper & Dahl 1991), only Rose (1992) has investigated the structure of DCTs, by comparing data elicited by situations with and without a hearer response added after the situation. However, Rose concluded that appending a hearer response had no significant effect on the data elicited. This study differs from Rose's in that it manipulates the internal content of the DCT situation and then asks what impact, if any, such manipulation has on the data elicited.

Construction of the DCT

This study examines 3 versions of a DCT designed to elicit requests. Situations for all three versions are derived from descriptions of situations used in the CCSARP project on requests (Blum-Kulka, et al. 1989), and later formulated by Rose, without hearer response. The CCSARP study provides an arena for comparing results because of the specific coding in-

structions the researchers put together for data analysis, and also because of the likelihood that subjects in this study would be familiar with the situations.

Version I (Original) uses the Rose situations, all of which embed in the situation information on requestive goal, social distance, and social dominance. These situations were modified slightly in the following ways. First, to encourage as full a response as possible, the response space was lengthened to 4" by 8.5". Next, in order to ascertain the respondents' assessment of both level of imposition and the interlocutor's likelihood of compliance, two questions were included after each situation. Finally, the emphasis of the speaker in the two hearer-dominant situations was changed so that subjects would actually take the roles of the librarian and professor rather than try to imagine from a distance how both of these individuals would respond. Below is an example of the Version I - Music situation. All of the Version I situations are found in Appendix A.

Example 1. Version I - Original: Music Situation

> You are trying to study in your room and you hear loud music coming from another student's room down the hall. You don't know the student, but you decide to ask them to turn the music down. What would you say?

Version II (Elaborated) was constructed by examining the literature to identify the type of social, contextual and psychological information critics of DCTs found lacking in the situations and others in the field regarded as necessary and relevant (Wolfson, Marmor & Jones 1989; Beebe & Cummings 1985; Hymes 1972). Appendix B identifies the variables which were selected for inclusion in each situation and either stated explicitly or implied. In addition to information on requestive goal, social distance and social dominance, the following information was included: the gender of the interlocutor, role relationship, length of acquaintance, the frequency of interaction, whether or not the relationship was optional, and a description of the setting, all of which set the scene psychologically. Below is an example of the elaborated Version II Music situation in which time and place are described, the interlocutor is given a name, along with some history to the request, thus providing the speaker with motivation for the ensuing act. The six Version II - Elaborated situations are found in Appendix C.

Example 2. Version II - Elaborated: Music Situation

> It is 10:30 p.m. on a Wednesday night and you have a paper due the next day. You are trying to finish the paper and you can't concentrate because you hear loud music coming from another student's room down the hall. You decide to ask her to turn the music down. The

music has been on at this volume for half an hour. You have occasionally seen the student, Lucy Row, in the same dorm during the past six months. She is a student like you but you have never spoken to her. You have heard other people in the dorm complain about the volume of her music on several occasions although you never have because you usually study in the library. However, today the library closed early. You are only half way through and you know that the professor for this class is very strict and does not give extensions. What would you say?

Version III (Timed) used exactly the same situational prompts as Version II (Elaborated) and then added one dimension: instructions to respondents were altered and subjects were asked to reflect on each situation for 30 seconds before writing their response (see Appendix D). This was done in order to encourage subjects to immerse themselves as much as possible in the psychosocial domain of each situation. Ultimately, we wondered if factors external to the situations themselves, and intrinsic to the test administration would have any effect on outcomes.

The Study

The subjects were 55 native speakers of American English, who were undergraduate and graduate students at the University of Pennsylvania. Although data from 32 non-native speakers were also collected, analysis of their responses is not included in this report and will be the subject of a later study. Version I (Original) was administered to twenty students, ten males and ten females; Version II (Elaborated) was administered to nineteen students, ten males and nine females. Version III (Timed) was administered to sixteen students, eight males and eight females. All three forms of the questionnaires were assigned randomly to each group. Data were collected primarily in classrooms, and subjects were not informed of the purpose of the study.

Data were then coded using the Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) and Rose (1992) coding scheme. The main categories of analysis were as follows:

1) Request strategies of the head act (frequency and type)

2) Internal modification of the head act (type and frequency)

3) Length of the entire request act including the head act and internal and external modification (mean number of words)

4) External modification of the head act (type and frequency)

Results and Discussion

Request Strategies of the Head Act

We first examined the head act of each request. A head act is defined by Blum-Kulka, et al. (1989) as "...the minimal unit which can realize a request." (p. 275) and excludes those parts of the act sequence which are not essential. The first category of analysis was the coding of requests by type of strategy. We began with the CCSARP (Blum-Kulka et al.) project's coding scheme and coded requests into 9 different types of strategies as shown in Appendix E. Following this initial step the strategies were collapsed into the following three main categories:

1) Direct strategies, D, where the understanding relies on syntactic devices or the semantic content of the utterance, such as,

Clean up this mess, please.

2) Conventionally indirect strategies, CI, where interpretation is aided by conventional usage,

How about cleaning up?

or reference to a preparatory condition,

Could you clean up the kitchen, please?

and finally,

3) Nonconventionally indirect strategies, NI, which includes strong or mild hints as in

You left this kitchen in a right mess.

Table 1 displays the frequency distribution of requests by the three main categories, Direct (D), Conventionally Indirect (CI) and Nonconventionally Indirect (NI). A chi-square test revealed no significant differences across versions in the distribution of request strategies in four situations. Although there appear to be significant differences in the Music and Extension situations, we feel that a claim of statistical significance would be improper due to the existence of too many empty cells in the chi-square for these situations.

In essence, the head act request strategy, appears to be unaffected by the addition of social and contextual information which Versions II (Elabo-

Table 1
Frequency distribution of request strategies

	MUSIC	NOTES	RIDE	LIBRARY	EXTEN.	PRESENT
Version	D C N	D C N	D C N	D C N	D C N	D C N
1(n=20)	4 15 0	2 18 0	0 13 1	8 9 1	0 14 2	1 14 1
2(n=19)	0 19 0	0 18 1	2 16 1	2 14 1	1 10 8	1 16 2
3(n=16)	0 13 0	0 14 0	0 9 4	3 12 1	2 14 0	2 13 0
		p <0.026				p<0.014

p < 0.05

Table 2.
Mean downgraders per request

	MUSIC	NOTES	RIDE	LIBRARY	EXTEN	PRESENT
1(n=20)	1.1	0.4	0.7	0.8	0.5	0.5
2(n=19)	1.3	1	0.7	0.9	0.6	0.6
3(n=16)	0.9	0.9	0.6	0.5	0.7	0.5

p = 0.032

p< 0.05

rated) and III (Timed) supplied. Overall, there was an overwhelming choice of conventionally indirect strategies across versions and in most situations. This indeed has been the main finding of the CCSARP project as well as the main finding of request studies using naturally occurring data. In fact, this area - main patterns and formulas - is the most widely-cited category of analysis where typical DCT data seem to replicate spoken data.

Head Act: Internal Modification

The next category of analysis, that of internal modification to the head act, was identified to determine whether amplified content had any bearing on how a speaker mitigated the request within the core act. The types of internal modification found were primarily downgraders, which include lexical and syntactic ways of softening the request, and a few instances of upgraders which intensify the request. Lexical downgraders include politeness markers such as *please*, consultative devices, *do you think*,

Table 3
Mean words per request

	MUSIC	NOTES	RIDE	LIBRARY	EXTEN	PRESENT
1(n=20)	14.2	12.8	24.4	10.0	22.6	17.3
2(n=19)	28.8	35.3	31.0	19.3	47.7	42.3
3(n=16)	23.8	31.6	33.7	18.8	49.7	39.0
	p = 0.042	p = 0.001		p = 0.005	p = 0.004	p = 0.001

p< 0.05

understaters or hedges like, *a bit*, as in, *Could you do your paper a bit earlier*. Syntactic downgraders include the use of tense and aspect, such as *I was wondering if...*, conditional clauses, and the use of the interrogative.

As the results of an ANOVA in Table 2 show, no significant differences were found in the use of downgraders across versions, except in the Notes situation. There, the difference was between Versions I (Original) and II (Elaborated) only.

In fact, the low mean value of downgraders, fewer than one per request across all situations, suggests that subjects are not mitigating their requests in the head act much at all. Thus far, our analysis of the core of the request - the head act - shows two things. First, that manipulation of situational content has no effect on choice of request strategy or amount of internal modification; and second that the overwhelming preference for conventionally indirect strategies seen here is consistent with previous studies which examine both naturally occurring and DCT data.

Length of the entire request act

We next compared the mean length of the entire request act across all three versions. As Table 3 shows the mean length of the request act in Versions II (Elaborated) and III (Timed) was two to three times greater than in the context-poor Version I (Original). An analysis of variance revealed significant differences in five of the six situations: the Music, Notes, Library, Extension and Presentation in mean length of response.

A post hoc comparison of means using the Scheffe test revealed that the significant differences were between the context-poor and both context rich-versions (Version I - Original and Version II - Elaborated; and between Version I-Original and Version III-Timed). No differences were found between the two context-rich versions (Versions II and III), leading us to conclude that instructions to the subjects to imagine themselves in the situation for 30 seconds before writing a response, produced no variation.

The difference in length can be illustrated by two typical examples of responses from Version I (Original) and Version II (Elaborated).

Example 3: Version I-Original: Music Situation

" I'm trying to study. Could you please turn down the music a little?"

And

Example 4: Version II-Elaborated: Music Situation

" Lucy, I'm really sorry to bother you, but if possible could you please lower the volume a little. Tomorrow I have a paper due and I'm really stressed out."

As one can see, the requestive head act in both versions is almost identical. Differences between response data from the context-poor versus context-rich versions lie almost exclusively outside the head act, a topic we will turn to next.

External Modification

The last major category of analysis is external modification, moves which occur outside the request head act. Two subcategories, supportive moves and alerters, were examined separately.

1) Supportive Moves

Supportive moves are ways that the speaker aggravates or mitigates an utterance. These include such acts as getting a precommitment (Could you do me a favor), disarmers (I'll give your notes right back), grounders (I had trouble with the data collection) and promises of reward (You can borrow my notes anytime).

Overall, the mean number of supportive moves in data elicited by the Elaborated and Timed situations (Versions II and III) was two to three times greater than the mean number of supportive moves in the context-poor Original situations (Version I data). Table 4 gives the results of an ANOVA of mean supportive moves per request and shows significant differences in all of the situations except for Music. The Scheffe test revealed, as expected, in all cases the differences were between the Original context-poor version (Version I) and both enriched versions (Versions II and III). No significant differences appeared between the Elaborated and Timed versions (Versions II and III). Data from the Presentation situations illustrates the differences between the elaborated and original versions.

Example 5: Version I - Original: Presentation Situation

"I was really hoping that you could present your paper one week earlier."

This request contains no external modification in the form of supportive moves.

Table 4
Mean supportive moves per request

	MUSIC	NOTES	RIDE	LIBRARY	EXTEN	PRESENT
1(n=20)	1.4	1.2	1.1	0.6	1.3	0.5
2(n=19)	1.9	2.4	2.1	1.2	3.1	2.3
3(n=16)	2.0	2.5	2.3	2.0	3.0	2.7
	p = 0.016	p = 0.048		p = 0.042	p = 0.003	p = 0.001

$p < 0.05$

The above example can be contrasted with a typical example of a request act taken from the Presentation situation for the Elaborated Version II, which includes a variety of supportive moves.

Example 6: Elaborated Version II: Presentation Situation

"Nancy, you are one of the strongest students in the department so I am hoping you can do me a favor. If you can't, it's no problem but we're studying the subject relevant to your presentation then. Can you get it ready? If not, it's okay."

The above response elicited by the elaborated prompt in Version II contains two imposition minimizers (*If you can't it's no problem* and *If not, it's okay*), a grounder (*we're studying the subject relevant to your presentation*) and a precommitment (*I am hoping that you can do me a favor*).

When we examined the types of supportive moves elicited by the two context-rich versions (Versions II and III), we found many more promises of reward, such as *I'll be more lenient with you for the grading*, and disarmers, such as *I know you have a lot of work*. We also saw other speech acts such as compliments present in the Elaborated Version II example above, as well as expressions of gratitude and apologies. All of these were found in abundance in data elicited by the elaborated and timed situations (Versions II and III) but hardly ever appeared in data elicited by the original situations (Version I).

Explanation for these findings is given by Beebe and Cummings (1985) who maintain that a typical DCT situation (similar to Version I situations) "...does not bring out the real...dynamics of natural interaction between members of a group" (p. 8). This is because respondents are addressing an anonymous fictional character and have no motivation to establish or preserve a relationship. And we saw evidence of this in the minimalist data elicited by the original context-poor (Version I) situations. However, the

enhancement of social, situational, and psychological content in Versions II and III may have provided respondents with a greater sense that they were interacting with a real person, in a real place and time, and more motivation to establish or maintain their reputation and rapport with the human being they were addressing. As our data show, when the psychosocial dimension of the situational prompt is augmented, then the written responses become more elaborated in much the same way speech in natural spontaneous interactions happens: with excuses and reasons, promises, and other means of saving one's own face and minimizing potential damage to another's.

2) Alerters

The second type of external modification we examined were alerters which are ways to warn the hearer of an upcoming speech act. Alerters include names and address terms, such as Tom, or Professor Smith, or attention getters such as Excuse me. Alerters were counted as one for an address term, an attention getter, or a combination of both.

The results of a chi square on the frequency distribution of alerters are reported in Table 5. They show that alerters appeared three times more frequently in data from the Elaborated and Timed versions (Versions II and III) than in data from the Original version (Version 1) in four of the six situations except for the Music and Ride situations.

It is possible that the supplemental information provided in these situations (Versions II and III), and, in particular, the interlocutor's names which were supplied in five situations gave subjects a "you are there" feel to the setting and succeeded in prompting them to frame the ensuing speech act with an alerter. A somewhat unexpected finding was the large number of alerters in the Library situation in spite of the fact that the hearer's name was not supplied. An explanation for this finding may be found in the situation itself, in which the librarian is interrupting a student who is speaking to someone else, thus resulting in a high frequency of "excuse me" type alerters.

Table 5:
Frequency distribution: alerters

Version	MUSIC	NOTES	RIDE	LIBRARY	EXTEN	PRESENT
1(n=20)	6	3	10	3	3	1
2(n=19)	10	12	14	8	12	11
3(n=16)	9	9	12	12	12	10
		$p < 0.003$		$p < 0.003$	$p < 0.003$	$p < 0.001$

$p < 0.05$

In the overall category of external modification, one could argue that the specific information supplied in the elaborated and timed versions (i.e., names, background to the relationship, contextual details) are inducing the respondents to perform more supportive work and use alerters. This may be the case. On the other hand, in real social interactions, participants are always surrounded by the context, are privy to background to the relationship, they know the names of their interlocutors and often have ready-made excuses to call upon when they need to make requests. In the elaborated and timed situations, respondents were given this same information and the option, as they would have in real life, to use it or not. In fact, in the original version (Version I) Extension situation, five respondents noted in parentheses that they would give a reason for not being able to complete their paper even though they were unable to formulate one at the time in writing. So the urge to mitigate the head act in some way is present, if not in the actual responses, at least in the respondents' minds.

Other Results

Finally, the Blum-Kulka et al.(1989) coding scheme was abandoned in order to examine qualities of the data which the coding scheme was not able to capture. We saw examples in data from the elaborated and timed versions (Versions II and III) of respondents constructing dialogues with their imaginary interlocutor, and even including paralinguistic information such as the next example illustrates:

Example 7. Version III - Timed: Music Situation

" I would knock on her door and say, 'Would you please turn down your music down." (not as a question). She will say OK and sorry. I will smile firmly and say, "Thanks."

Some even combined an initial one-sided dialogue with a very elaborate narrative preamble to the request, as the example below shows.

Example 8. Version III - Timed: Notes Situation

" Hey Tom, how's it going? Have you been keeping up with the 76ers? No? Well, I tell you last week's game was incredible. Yeah, it went into triple overtime and the 76ers won. Afterwards, my roommates dragged me out to the local bar and we had a few drinks. Unfortunately, I was a bit hung over and missed class. I know I've already borrowed your notes twice this semester but I was wondering if I could see last week's notes. I have an old exam and we should study for the final together next week. I'll give you a call. Hey, take care and go 76ers!"

Again, it seems that when subjects are invited into a richer interpersonal context, even on paper, they are able to envision a more complex

relationship with their interlocutor and are able to call upon a much wider array of linguistic resources.

Summary and Conclusion

In summary, no significant differences were found across versions in either measure of the request head act itself, specifically: 1) the distribution of head act request strategies across the three major categories, direct, conventionally indirect, or nonconventionally indirect, or 2) forms of internal modification to the head act, namely the frequency of lexical and syntactic softening devices. The preference for conventionally indirect request strategies in this study is consistent with previous DCT studies of requests (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989) and studies of naturally occurring requests.

However, significant differences in response data were found between the unelaborated and both elaborated versions (between Versions I and II and between Versions I and III) on the following measures:

1) Mean length of entire request act in both the elaborated and timed versions (Versions II and III) was two to three times longer than the mean length of the request act in the original Version I, in five out of six situations.

2) In the category of external modification there were two findings: the mean number of supportive moves was two to three times greater in both the elaborated and timed versions (Versions II and III) than in the original version (Version I) in five out of six situations; furthermore, the frequency of alerters was three times greater in both the elaborated and timed versions (Versions II and III) than in the original version (Version I) in four out of six situations.

Finally, no differences were found on any measure between the elaborated version (Version II) and the timed version (Version III).

The limitations of this study include the lack of distracter items in the questionnaire so that respondents would not be able to infer the subject of the study and the, as yet, unfinished check on inter-rater reliability. Since the design of this study failed to compare the original version with and without a 30-second pause, it was not possible to really ascertain whether the variation in response data for the timed version was a factor of the elaborated situational prompts or a factor of the additional time subjects were asked to ponder each situation, or a combination of both.

In conclusion, it appears that certain components of the request act are sensitive to variation in the internal structure of the DCT, but others are not. When these findings are placed alongside those studies which compare oral data with written DCT data, some interesting patterns emerge. The head act appears to be a 'hard-wired' component of requests. This is

borne out by the remarkable regularity with which conventionally indirect strategies occur in data gathered by both elicited and observational methods. When we look beyond the head act, to the external parts of the request, the data elicited by means of elaborated DCT situations look more like oral face-to-face interactions than do data elicited by means of the typically brief, context-impoverished DCT situations. When subjects are given more information in the situations, they appear to modify their discourse in ways closer to natural conversation.

Therefore, it may be that certain types of written prompts are more powerful than others, and that some are strong enough to simulate the psychosocial dimension of live situations. If this were the case, researchers might be able to trust a written instrument to elicit speech act data more comparable to natural speech. A great deal more research needs to be conducted on the limits of such methods, and careful consideration given to the overall value of elicited written data in investigations of speech behavior. Nevertheless, examining the internal structure of data collection instruments is an important and fruitful area for further study.

References

Beebe, L. M., & Cummings, M. (1985). *Speech act performance: A function of the data collection procedure?* Paper presented at the Sixth Annual TESOL and Sociolinguistics Colloquim at the International TESOL Convention, New York.

Beebe, L. M., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R., (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R. Scarcella, E. Anderson, & S. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 55-73). New York: Newbury House.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1982). Learning how to say what you mean in a second language: A study of the speech act performance of learners of Hebrew as a second language. *Applied Linguistics*, 3, 29-59.

Blum-Kulka, S., & House, J. (1989). Cross-cultural and situational variation in requesting behavior. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 123-154). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (Eds.) (1989). *Cross cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Eisenstein, M., & Bodman, J. (1986). I very appreciate: Expressions of gratitude by native and non-native speakers of American English. *Applied Linguistics*, 7, 167-185.

Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 13, 215-247.

Labov, W. (1966). *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Manes, J., & Wolfson, N. (1981). The compliment formula. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Conversational routine* (pp. 115-132). The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton.

Olshtain, E. (1989). Apologies across languages. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, and G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 155-173). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. (1983). Apology: A speech act set. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp. 18-35). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Rose, K. (1992). Speech act research and written questionnaires: The effect of hearer response. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 17: 49-62.

Wolfson, N. (1989). *Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Wolfson, N., Marmor, T., & Jones, S. (1989). Problems in the comparison of speech acts across cultures. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, and G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 174-196). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Manka Varghese is a Ph.D. candidate in Educational Linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania and an ESL lecturer at the English Language Programs at the University of Pennsylvania.

Kristine Billmyer is Director of the English Language Programs at Penn and adjunct professor in educational linguistics at the Graduate School of Education.

Appendix A

Situations in Version 1 (Rose, 1992)

1) You are trying to study in your room and you hear loud music coming from another student's room down the hall. You don't know the student, but you decide to ask them to turn the music down. What would you say?

2) You missed class and need to borrow a friend's notes. What would you say?

3) You need a ride home from school. You notice someone who lives down the street from you is also at school, but you haven't spoken to this person before. You think they might have a car. What would you say?

4) A student in the library is making too much noise and disturbing other students . The librarian decides to ask the student to quiet down. What will the librarian say?

5) Your term paper is due, but you haven't finished it yet. You want to ask the professor for an extension. What would you say?

6) A professor wants a student to present a paper in class a week earlier than scheduled. What would the professor say?

Appendix B

Checklist for variables	*Situations*
CONTENT	1 2 3 4 5 6
Gender of interlocutor	
Social Distance	
Role relationship	
Requestive goal	
Length of acquaintanceship	
Imposition/Privacy(hearer's perception)	
Frequency of interaction(explicit)	
Optionality of relationship(explicit)	
Compliance likelihood of interlocutor	
Setting and scene (time, place, circumstances and psychological)	

Appendix C

Situations in Versions 2 and 3

1) It is 10:30 p.m. on a Wednesday night and you have a paper due the next day. You are trying to finish the paper and you can't concentrate because you hear loud music coming from another student's room down the hall. You decide to ask her to turn the music down. The music has been on at this volume for half an hour. You have occasionally seen the student, Lucy Row, in the same dorm during the past six months. She is a student like you but you have never spoken to her. You have heard other people in the dorm complain about the volume of her music on several occasions although you never have because you usually study in the library. However today the library closed early. You are only half way through and you know that the professor for this class is very strict and does not give extensions. What would you say?

2) You are at the end of a history class and you are sitting next to Tom Yates. You missed last week's class and need to borrow his notes. He has been in the same program as you for one year and see him socially about once a month in a group. You will also be taking classes together in the future.. He is a good note taker and one of the best students in the class. You have borrowed his notes twice before for the same class and the last time you borrowed them he was reluctant to give them up. In two weeks you both have the final exam for your class. What would you say?

3) It's 5.30 p.m., your last class has just finished and you need a ride home. You realize that a fellow classmate who was supposed to give you a ride is not in class today. You have a lot of books with you tonight, the snow has made walking difficult and you need a ride home form school. As you come out of class, you see Alice Thomas, an assistant professor in the department who teaches a class that ends at the same time as yours. She lives on the same street as you and she is standing talking to some other students. She is smiling and laughing. You have never spoken to her before but you have seen her on occasion in the department in the last few months and have both nodded to each other once or twice in the neighborhood. You know that she has a car and once saw her give a lift to one of the students. What would you say?

4) It is the end of the working day on Friday. You are a librarian and have been working in the University Reserve Room for two years. You like your job and usually the Reserve Room is quiet. Today, a student is making noise and disturbing other students. You decide to ask the student to quiet down. The student is a male student who you have often seen work on his own in the past two months but today he is explaining something to another student in a very loud voice. A lot of students are in the library and they are studying for their mid-term exams. You notice that some of the other students are looking in his direction in an annoyed manner. What would you say?

5) Your term paper is due for a course in your major, but you haven't finished it yet. You want to ask the professor for an extension. You had a lot of difficulty collecting data for the paper, but you think you finally have enough and the paper will be really good if you could have another week to put it together. Your professor is Dr. Robert Smith, senior member of the department and possibly your thesis advisor, if things go as you hope they will. You have done well in this course up to now, and he is aware of the problem with data collection. You took one course with Dr. Smith at the beginning of your studies a year and a half ago and got an A, but you haven't had much opportunity to interact with him since then. You have an appointment with Dr. Smith a few days before the paper is due. You know he rarely gives extensions on term papers because he is usually very busy and immediately after this semester is over he will leave the campus to do field work. However, you think you might have a chance because the paper is on a topic he is interested in. You are in his office now. What would you say?

6) You (an associate professor teaching a course in psychology) want a student to present a paper in a class a week earlier than scheduled. It is the middle of the term and topics were assigned at the beginning of the course. The presentation is 15-minute class summary and critique of a supplementary journal article. Your student is Nancy Porter, a very competent student who always contributes to class discussions and is very well prepared for class. Even though you have never had her in class before this semester, she has a reputation as one of the best students in the department. You want her to present next week instead of three weeks from now because her article is more relevant to next week's lecture. However, midterm exams are next week and you know she has a heavy course load. She has made several contributions during this class, and has been given some good feedback from you. You ask her if you could see her for a minute after class. The students have all left and you are talking to her alone. What would you say?

Appendix D

Version #3

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read each situation and imagine yourself in it. Please reflect for 30 seconds and then write down what you would say. Use as much or as little space as you need. Finally, please answer the questions that follow each situation.

1) It is 10:30 p.m. on a Wednesday night and you have a paper due the next day. You are trying to finish the paper and you can't concentrate because you hear loud music coming from another student's room down the hall. You decide to ask her to turn the music down. The music has been on at this volume for half an hour. You have occasionally seen the student, Lucy Row, in the same dorm during the past six months. She is a student like you but you have never spoken to her. You have heard other people in the dorm complain about the volume of her music on several occasions although you never have because you usually study in the library. However today the library closed early. You are only half way through and you know that the professor for this class is very strict and does not give extensions. What would you say?

YOU:

How imposed upon do you think Lucy will feel?

not imposed upon		moderately imposed upon		very imposed upon
1	2	3	4	5

How likely do you think Lucy is to comply?

not likely		moderately likely		very likely
1	2	3	4	5

Appendix E

Request Strategies

Direct

Clean up this mess, please.	Mood Derivable
I'm asking you not to park the car here.	Explicit Performative
I would like you to give your lecture a week earlier.	Hedged Performative
Madam, you'll have to move your car.	Locution Derivable
I'd really wish you'd stop bothering me.	Scope Stating

Conventionally Indirect

How about cleaning up?	Suggestory Formula
Could you clear up the kitchen please?	Preparatory Condition

Nonconventionally Indirect

You've left this kitchen in a right mess.	Strong Hint
I'm a nun. (In response to a persistent boy)	Mild Hint

(Blum-Kulka et al., 1989)